



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS  
Washington, D.C. 20231  
[www.uspto.gov](http://www.uspto.gov)

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/341,347	07/08/1999	GURMINDER SINGH	U.012304-4	5018

7590                    02/26/2003

LADAS & PARRY  
26 WEST 61ST STREET  
NEW YORK, NY 10023

[REDACTED] EXAMINER

HUYNH, CONG LAC T

[REDACTED] ART UNIT

[REDACTED] PAPER NUMBER

2178

DATE MAILED: 02/26/2003

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

<b>Office Action Summary</b>	<b>Application No.</b>	<b>Applicant(s)</b>	
	09/341,347	SINGH ET AL.	
	Examiner Cong-Lac Huynh	Art Unit 2178	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

#### Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

#### Status

1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 08 July 1999.

2a) This action is FINAL.                  2b) This action is non-final.

3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

#### Disposition of Claims

4) Claim(s) 1-84 is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.

6) Claim(s) 1-84 is/are rejected.

7) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.

8) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

#### Application Papers

9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10) The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

11) The proposed drawing correction filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is: a) approved b) disapproved by the Examiner.  
If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.

12) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

#### Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

13) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).  
a) All b) Some \* c) None of:  
1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.  
2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.  
3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

14) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).  
a) The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.

15) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

#### Attachment(s)

1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)	4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). _____ .
2) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)	5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
3) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) <u>6 &amp; 7</u> .	6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____

## DETAILED ACTION

1. This action is responsive to communications: the application filed on 7/8/99, which is a national stage entry of PCT/SG98/00096 International Filing Date 11/27/98, and the IDSs filed on 2/11/00 and 6/13/00.
2. Claims 1-84 are pending in the case. Claims 1, 16, 30, 45, 55, 65, 76, 79, 82 are independent claims.

### *Claim Objections*

3. The numbering of claims is not in accordance with 37 CFR 1.126 which requires the original numbering of the claims to be preserved throughout the prosecution. When claims are canceled, the remaining claims must not be renumbered. When new claims are presented, they must be numbered consecutively beginning with the number next following the highest numbered claims previously presented (whether entered or not).

Regarding claim 29, since there are two 29 claims, the second claim 29 has been renumbered as claim 30. Claim 30-73 have been renumbered as claims 31-74 accordingly.

Please note that claim 74 was not originally used in numbering the claims, but now original claim 73 has been renumbered as claim 74. Claims 76-84 remain as 76-84. Applicants is required to use the new claim numbering when referring to the claims.

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112***

4. The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

5. Claim 55 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

Regarding claim 55, it is not clear what said linking means is dependent upon, the content or said at least one of animation, audio, and video data in the limitation "wherein said linking means is dependent upon the content said at least one of animation, audio, and video data." It appears that in line 2 of the claim, "the content of said" would overcome the rejection.

Still in claim 55, it is suggested that the claim language be changed to "said linking is dependent upon the content..." instead of "said linking means is dependent upon the content ..." since it is not reasonable that a *means* for performing linking step is dependent on the *content of the video data*.

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102***

6. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

Art Unit: 2178

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) the invention was described in a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention thereof by the applicant for patent, or on an international application by another who has fulfilled the requirements of paragraphs (1), (2), and (4) of section 371(c) of this title before the invention thereof by the applicant for patent.

The changes made to 35 U.S.C. 102(e) by the American Inventors Protection Act of 1999 (AIPA) do not apply to the examination of this application as the application being examined was not (1) filed on or after November 29, 2000, or (2) voluntarily published under 35 U.S.C. 122(b). Therefore, this application is examined under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) prior to the amendment by the AIPA (pre-AIPA 35 U.S.C. 102(e)).

7. Claims 1, 4-10, 16,19-25, 31, 34-40, 46-47, 54-57, 64-67, 74, 75 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by LaJoie et al. (US Pat No. 6,049,333, 4/11/00, filed 9/3/96).

Regarding independent claim 1 and its dependent claim 6, LaJoie discloses:

- providing time-sequence data where said time-sequence data is animation, audio, and/or video data (col 1, lines 5-12, 46-55: video is provided via telecasting where it was well known that the programs on television are time-sequence data)
- separately providing supplemental information, action, or both, from said time-sequence data (col 2, line 61 to col 3, line 3: data used to construct the event database is from data providers transmitted to the telecasting facility through

Art Unit: 2178

suitable network link wherein said data is separate from the video data telecasted from the telecasting facility)

- linking said supplemental information, action, or both, with said time-sequence data during the playback of said time-sequence data (col 2, lines 18-36: "presenting on a television, information contained in an event database, wherein the displayed information pertains to televised events"; col 10, lines 30-54: the event whose content related to the video content telecasting is generated and displayed to user; col 3, lines 38-43: "simultaneously presenting video content and information from the event database on the viewer's television when the viewer requests information from the event database"; the fact that the video being presented to users and the related information, which is considered equivalent to the supplemental information, are displayed to users inherently shows the linking between these two data)

Regarding claim 4, which is dependent on claim 1, LaJoie discloses that said supplemental information is content-linked with said time-sequence data (col 2, lines 31-36: "presenting on a television, information contained in an event database, wherein the displayed information *pertains to televised events ...*"; col 10, lines 44-54: the event database banner is automatically generated with the information from the event database that pertains to the television program to which the viewer tuned).

Regarding claim 5, which is dependent on claim 4, LaJoie discloses that said supplemental information is linked with said time-sequence data dependent upon on-the-fly analysis of the content of said time-sequence data during playback of said time-sequence data (col 10, lines 44-54: the event database banner is automatically generated with the information from the event database that pertains to the television program to which the viewer tuned).

Regarding claims 7-9, which are dependent on claim 1, LaJoie discloses:

- said time-sequence data is provided by broadcast via a network (col 1, lines 5-12 and col 2, lines 1-40: video of TV programs is broadcast over the TV network)
- said supplemental information is provided remotely via a network (col 2, lines 61-67: the fact that the telecasting facility obtains data used to construct the event database from various data providers through a *conventional link*, a *satellite* or a *suitable network link* shows that said event information is provided remotely via a network)

Regarding claim 10, which is dependent on claim 1, LaJoie discloses that said supplemental information includes a displayed prompt with which a user can interact by user input (figure 9: the football theater includes icon #114 that allows a user to interact by inputting a user's selection, for example, war stories).

Art Unit: 2178

Claims 16, 19-25 are for an apparatus of method claims 1, 4-10, and therefore are rejected under the same rationale.

Claims 31, 34-40 are for a computer program product of method claims 1, 4-10, and therefore are rejected under the same rationale.

Regarding independent claim 46, and its dependent claim 47, LaJoie discloses:

- delivering said at least one of animation, audio, and video data for presentation to said user (col 2, lines 17-40 and col 3, lines 30-46: a user watches televised video)
- providing said value-added content being separate from said at least one of animation, audio and video data (col 2, line 61 to col 3, line 3: data used to construct the event database, considered as value-added content, is from data providers transmitted to the telecasting facility through suitable network link wherein said data is separate from the video data telecasted from the telecasting facility)
- providing linking means, separate from said at least one of animation, audio, and video data, for linking said value-added content with said at least one of animation, audio, and video data in a controllable and on-the-fly manner prior presentation of said at least one of animation, audio, and video data and said value-added content (col 2, lines 18-36: "presenting on a television, information contained in an event database, wherein the displayed information pertains to

televised events"; col 10, lines 30-54: the event whose content related to the video content telecasting is generated and displayed to user; col 3, lines 4-7: "the telecasting facility preferably includes computer systems that assemble data from one or more data providers to construct the event database, and *transmit the event database to set-op terminal along with the video content*"; the fact that the video being presented to users and the related information, which is considered equivalent to the value-added content, are displayed to users inherently shows the linking between these two data)

- presenting for said user said at least one of animation, audio, and video data and said value-added content (col 2, lines 18-36: "presenting on a television, information contained in an event database, wherein the displayed information pertains to televised events"; col 10, lines 30-54: the event whose content related to the video content telecasting is generated and displayed to user; col 3, lines 38-43: "simultaneously presenting video content and information from the event database on the viewer's television when the viewer requests information from the event database")

Claims 56-57 are for an apparatus of method claims 46-47, and therefore are rejected under the same rationale.

Claims 66-67 are for a computer program product of method claims 46-47, and therefore are rejected under the same rationale.

Regarding claim 54, which is dependent on claim 47, LaJoie discloses that said value-added content is presented in or on said at least one of animation, audio and video data in a device for reproducing said at least one of animation, audio and video data (col 2, lines 18-36: "presenting on a television, information contained in an event database, wherein the displayed information pertains to televised events"; col 10, lines 30-54: the event whose content related to the video content telecasting is generated and displayed to user; col 3, lines 38-43: "simultaneously presenting video content and information from the event database on the viewer's television when the viewer requests information from the event database").

Regarding claim 55, which is dependent on claim 46, LaJoie discloses that said linking means is dependent upon the content said at least one of animation, audio, and video data (col 2, lines 18-36: "presenting on a television, information contained in an event database, wherein the displayed information pertains to televised events").

Claims 64-65 are for an apparatus of method claims 54-55, and are rejected under the same rationale.

Claims 74, 75 are for a computer program product of method claims 54-55, and therefore are rejected under the same rationale.

8. Claims 76-84 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Neel et al. (US Pat No. 5,838,314, 11/17/98, filed 2/21/96).

Regarding independent claim 76, Neel discloses:

- delivering said animation, audio, and/or video data for presentation (abstract; col 5, lines 15-30; col 17, lines 45-50)
- delivering a separate advertisement related to said animation, audio and/or video data (abstract; col 5, lines 15-30)
- presenting for a user said advertisement during presentation of said animation, audio, and/or video data dependent upon said advertisement control link (col 5, lines 15-30)
- providing an advertisement control link for linking said separate advertisement with said animation, audio, and/or video data (col 5, lines 15-30; the fact that the related advertisement and the video are presented to users inherently shows that such a linking is performed)

Regarding claim 77, which is dependent on claim 76, Neel discloses that said advertisement is capable of connecting a user with a remote location via a network by user interaction with said advertisement (col 12, lines 47-67; col 19, lines 13-27).

Regarding claim 78, which is dependent on claim 77, Neel discloses the step of vending a product or service by means of electronic commerce or contacting a call center dependent upon said advertisement (col 19, lines 13-35; the interactive advertisement is

used to purchase a service or a product where the user can call the front desk for assistance or the process of the product payment).

Claims 79-81 are for an apparatus of method claims 76-78, and are rejected under the same rationale.

Claims 82-84 are for a computer program product of method claims 76-78, and are rejected under the same rationale.

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

9. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

10. This application currently names joint inventors. In considering patentability of the claims under 35 U.S.C. 103(a), the examiner presumes that the subject matter of the various claims was commonly owned at the time any inventions covered therein were made absent any evidence to the contrary. Applicant is advised of the obligation under 37 CFR 1.56 to point out the inventor and invention dates of each claim that was not commonly owned at the time a later invention was made in order for the examiner to consider the applicability of 35 U.S.C. 103(c) and potential 35 U.S.C. 102(e), (f) or (g) prior art under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).

11. Claims 2, 13-15, 17, 28-<sup>29</sup>~~29~~, 32, 43-45, 49, 59, 69, 52-53, 62-63, 72-73 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over LaJoie et al. (US Pat No. 6,049,333, 4/11/00, filed 9/3/96).

Regarding claim 2, which is dependent on claim 1, LaJoie does not explicitly disclose that said supplemental information is linked with said time-sequence data by a start time and a stop time. Instead LaJoie discloses telecasting the television programs (col 1, lines 5-12; col 2, lines 37-40).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to have modified LaJoie to include the feature "said supplemental information is linked with said time-sequence data by a start time and a stop time" since it was well known that each television program has a start time and the stop time (provided in the TV guide).

Regarding claim 13, which is dependent on claim 1, LaJoie discloses said time-sequence data and said supplemental information are linked by a link means (col 2, lines 18-16: the fact that the displayed information pertains the televised events shows the linking between the video televised and the displayed information and so suggests a link means for performing the linking function; col 3, lines 30-38: "the set-op terminal used in connection with the present invention is capable of simultaneously presenting video content and information from the event database on the viewer's television ...").

Regarding claim 14, which is dependent on claim 13, LaJoie discloses that two or more of said link means, said time-sequence data, and said supplemental information, action, or both, are initially co-located at their source (col 2, line 61 to col 3, line 7: the event database is transmitted to the set-op terminal along with the video content suggests that the event database and the video may be co-located at their source).

Regarding claim 15, which is dependent on claim 13, LaJoie discloses that two or more of said link means, said time-sequence data, and said supplemental information, action, or both, are initially remotely located at one or more source locations (col 2, lines 61-67: the fact that the event database which includes information displayed in conjunction with the displayed video is from various data providers that provide data to the telecasting facility through a conventional modem link, a satellite or a suitable network link shows that the event information and the video data are remotely located at different locations).

30  
Claims 17, 28-29 are for an apparatus of method claims 2, 13-15, and therefore are rejected under the same rationale.

Claims 32, 43-45 are for a computer program product of method claims 2, 13-15 and therefore are rejected under the same rationale.

Regarding claim 49, which is dependent on claim 46, LaJoie does not explicitly disclose that said linking means includes a start time and a stop time of said value-added content in relation to said at least one of said animation, audio, and video data.

However, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to have modified LaJoie to include a start time and a stop time of said value-added content in relation to said at least one of said animation, audio, and video data since it was well known that the television programs have the start time and stop time, and since the event information in LaJoie is displayed simultaneously with the video content (col 3, lines 30-38), the event information should comply the start time and the stop time of the video data.

Regarding claim 52, which is dependent on claim 46, LaJoie does not explicitly disclose that said value-added content includes a set of instructions for performing operations on a local apparatus or a remote apparatus linked with said local apparatus by a network.

Instead LaJoie discloses that the event information includes an icon that allows a user to select from the menu (figure 9: the football theater includes icon #114 that allows a user to interact by inputting a user's selection, namely, war stories).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to have modified LaJoie to include "said value-added content ... by a network" since the icon #114 allows a user to perform the select operation on the local apparatus, which is the TV.

Claims 59 and 69 are for an apparatus and a computer program product of method claim 49, and are rejected under the same rationale.

Claims 62 and 72 are for an apparatus and a computer program product of method claim 49, and are rejected under the same rationale.

Regarding claim 53, which is dependent on claim 47, LaJoie does not explicitly disclose that said value-added content is presented separately in a device for reproducing said at least one of animation, audio and video data.

Instead LaJoie discloses constructing a desired event database from data providers is performed separately before transmitted to the set-op terminal along with the video content (col 2, line 61 to col 3, line 7).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to have modified LaJoie to include the feature "said value-added content is presented separately in a device ..." since the fact that the event database is constructed separately from the video data suggests that the event information, which is equivalent to the value-added content, be presented separately in a device for any reproducing functions as desired.

Claims 63 and 73 are for an apparatus and a computer program product of method claim 49, and are rejected under the same rationale.

12. Claims 3, 18, 33, 50, 60, 70 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over LaJoie as applied to claims 1, 16, 31, 46, 56 above, and further in view of Gupta et al. (US Pat No. 6,484,156, 11/19/02, filed 11/15/99, priority filed 9/15/98).

Regarding claim 3, which is dependent on claim 1, LaJoie discloses that said supplemental information is linked with said time-sequence data (col 2, lines 16-38) but LaJoie does not disclose that said linking is done by annotation information associated with said time-sequence data.

Gupta discloses the association of an annotation with the current media stream being presented to the user (figure 9; col 12, lines 20-33).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to have combined Gupta into LaJoie to enhance the display of the video of LaJoie with the annotation data for conveying more data to users while telecasting video.

Claim 18 is for an apparatus of method claim 3, and therefore is rejected under the same rationale.

Claim 33 is for a computer program product of method claim 3, and therefore is rejected under the same rationale.

Regarding claim 50, which is dependent on claim 46, LaJoie discloses that the value-added content is linked with the video data (col 2, lines 16-38: the event information pertains the video content televised to viewers) but LaJoie does not disclose that said linking is done by annotation information associated with said time-sequence data.

Gupta discloses the association of an annotation with the current media stream being presented to the user (figure 9; col 12, lines 20-33).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to have combined Gupta into LaJoie to enhance the display of the video of LaJoie with the annotation data for conveying more useful data to users while telecasting video.

Claims 60 and 70 are for an apparatus and a computer program product of method claim 50, and are rejected under the same rationale.

13. Claims 11-12, 26-27, 41-42, 48, 51, 58, 61, 68, 71 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over LaJoie as applied to claim 1 above, and further in view of Neel et al. (US Pat No. 5,838,314, 11/17/98, filed 2/21/96) and Angles et al. (US Pat No. 5,933,811, 8/3/99, filed 8/20/96).

Regarding claims 11-12, LaJoie does not disclose that said supplemental information includes a link to a remote location, wherein said link is a universal resource locator (URL).

Neel provides users the ability of watching video and a related advertisement (col 4, lines 1-30; col 5, lines 15-30). However, Neel does not disclose that said advertisement includes a link to a remote location, wherein said link is a universal resource locator (URL).

Angles discloses that the advertisement delivered to users can contain hyperlinks to other information for customers who wish to obtain additional information about an advertised product (col 4, lines 6-16; col 15, lines 43-55).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to have combined Neel and Angles into LaJoie for the following reason.

Neel provides the feature of watching video and the related advertisement wherein the related advertisement is considered equivalent to a supplemental information of the televised video (as in LaJoie). Angles provides the feature of containing hyperlinks in the advertisements delivered to users wherein said hyperlinks are URLs that link to remotes locations. The combination of Neel and Angles into LaJoie would enhance the convenience for users to watch video and further obtain more information of a related product advertisement concurrently.

Claims 26-27 are for an apparatus of method claims 11-12, and therefore are rejected under the same rationale.

Claims 41-42 are for a computer program product of method claims 11-12, and therefore are rejected under the same rationale.

Regarding claims 48 and 51, which are dependent on claim 46, LaJoie does not disclose that the value-added content is an advertisement and includes a universal resource locator (URL).

As mentioned in claims 11-12 above, Neel provides users the ability of watching video and a related advertisement (col 4, lines 1-30; col 5, lines 15-30). However, Neel does not disclose that said advertisement includes a link to a remote location, wherein said link is a universal resource locator (URL).

Angles discloses that the advertisement delivered to users can contain hyperlinks to other information for customers who wish to obtain additional information about an advertised product (col 4, lines 6-16; col 15, lines 43-55).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to have combined Neel and Angles into LaJoie for the following reason.

Neel provides the feature of watching video and the related advertisement, which is equivalent to the supplement information to the televised video in LaJoie. Angles discloses hyperlinks in the advertisements delivered to users wherein said hyperlinks are URLs that link to remotes locations. The combination of Neel and Angles into LaJoie would enhance the convenience for users to watch video and further obtain more information of a related product advertisement concurrently since the advertisement which relates to the content of the video being presented to a viewer is considered equivalent to the value-added content related to the video data.

Claims 58, 61 are for an apparatus of method claims 48, 51, and therefore are rejected under the same rationale.

Claims 68, 71 are for a computer program product of method claims 48, 51, and therefore are rejected under the same rationale.

***Conclusion***

14. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

Wodarz et al. (US Pat No. 5,999,912, 12/7/99, filed 5/1/97, priority 5/1/96).

Berezowski et al. (US Pat No. 6,064,376, 5/16/00, filed 3/13/97).

Freeman et al. (US Pat No. 5,861,881, 1/19/99, filed 2/8/96).

Purnaveja et al. (US Pat No. 6,006,241, 12/21/99, filed 3/14/97).

Dodson et al. (US Pat No. 6,184,877 B1, 2/6/01, filed 12/11/96).

Hooks et al. (US Pat No. 6,169,542, 1/2/01, filed 12/14/98).

Middleton et al. (US Pat No. 6,393,407 B1, 5/21/02, filed 9/2/98, priority 9/11/97).

Rangan et al. (US Pat No. 6,198,833 B1, 3/6/01, filed 9/16/98).

Cannon (EP 0 711 076 A2, 5/8/96, filed 10/24/95).

Schulman (US Pat No. 5,600,366, 2/4/97, filed 3/22/95).

Lowe et al. (US Pat No. 6,298,218 B1, 10/2/01, filed 9/28/98).

Valdez, Jr. (US Pat No. 6,426,778 B1, 7/30/02, filed 4/3/98).

Fuller et al. (US Pat No. 6,216,112 B1, 4/10/01 filed 5/27/98).

Bretan et al., *Concurrent Engineering for an Interactive TV Interface*, ACM 1996, pages 117-118.

Risden et al., *Interactive Advertising : Patterns of Use and Effectiveness*, ACM April 1996, pages 219-224.

Morin et al., *HyperNews : A Media Application for the Commercialization of an Electronic Newspaper*, ACM 1998, pages 696-705.

15. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Cong-Lac Huynh whose telephone number is 703-305-0432. The examiner can normally be reached on Mon-Fri (8:30-6:00).

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Heather Herndon can be reached on 703-308-5186. The fax phone numbers for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned are 703-746-7239 for regular communications and 707-746-7238 for After Final communications.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is 703-305-9000.

clh  
February 10, 2003

*Heather L. Herndon*  
HEATHER R. HERNDON  
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER  
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2100